

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 246

AC 014 424

TITLE Cablevision for Continuing Education and Community Programs, Conference Presentations (Regina, November 28-29, 1972).

INSTITUTION Saskatchewan Association for Lifelong Learning.

PUB DATE 72

NOTE 60p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education Programs; *Cable Television; Community Colleges; *Community Programs; *Conference Reports; Educational Television; Programing (Broadcast); University Extension

IDENTIFIERS *Canada; Saskatchewan

ABSTRACT

The Conference on Cablevision for Continuing Education and Community Programs was held to present the present situation of the development of cablevision in Canada and to indicate some of the future possibilities for its use in continuing education and community programming in Saskatchewan. Following the keynote address, three panels presented speeches. In Panel I, "What Is Cablevision?," a brief explanation of cablevision was given. In Panel II, "Policy and Regulations Regarding Educational and Community Programs," three papers were given: "A Review of Provincial Policy as of November, 1972"; "The 'State of the Art' of Local Programming by Cable Operators in Canada, Summer, 1972"; and "Broadcasting: For Whose Benefit?" In Panel III, "Cablevision for Continuing Education and Community Programs in Saskatchewan," three papers were also presented: "Cablevision, Community College and Library Development--A Viewpoint"; "Cablevision for Learning and University Extension"; and "Cablevision for Moose Jaw--A Community Concern." (KM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SASKATCHEWAN ASSOCIATION

FOR

LIFELONG LEARNING

CABLEVISION

FOR

CONTINUING EDUCATION

AND

COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

Conference Presentations

Regina, November 28 and 29, 1972

ED 078246

NO 14434

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table of Contents.....	1
Acknowledgements.....	2
Conference Program.....	3
CONFERENCE KEYNOTE ADDRESS - Alan Thomas.....	4
PANEL I "WHAT IS CABLEVISION?"	
- A Brief Explanation - Gordon Jackson.....	15
PANEL II "POLICY AND REGULATIONS REGARDING EDUCATIONAL AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS".....	20
- A Review of Provincial Policy as of November, 1972 - Ted Reed.....	21
- The "State of the Art" of Local Programming by Cable Operators in Canada, Summer, 1972 - Frank Spiller.....	26
- Broadcasting: For Whose Benefit? - Graham Spry.....	37
PANEL III "CABLEVISION FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS IN SASKATCHEWAN.....	46
- Cablevision, Community College and Library Development - A Viewpoint - Ron Faris.....	47
- Cablevision for Learning and University Extension - Brock Whale.....	53
- Cablevision for Moose Jaw - A Community Concern - Doreen Wahl.....	56
Organizations Represented at Conference.....	59

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Conference on Cablevision for Continuing Education and Community Programs has come and gone, and has left us more knowledgeable. We were fortunate to be able to get outstanding personalities as speakers and panelists and we thank all of them for finding time to take part. The conference objective was to inform interested Saskatchewan people, especially educators, about some of the present realities in the development of cablevision in Canada and to indicate some of the future possibilities for its use in continuing education and community programming in Saskatchewan. We hope that for those who attended it did clear up some of the current misconceptions concerning cablevision, and that perhaps it gave shape to a vision of an attainable future. If at the same time it helped provide a stimulus toward further research and effort in the development of cablevision for community use, then it was well worth while.

We wish to thank the Department of Continuing Education, Province of Saskatchewan, and the Department of Extension, University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, for their cooperation and assistance in providing leadership in this important field.

Stewart P. Thompson,

President, SALL.

Conference on
CABLEVISION FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

at
UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN, REGINA CAMPUS
IN LUTHER COLLEGE

Tuesday, November 28 and Wednesday, November 29, 1972
sponsored by the SASKATCHEWAN ASSOCIATION OF LIFELONG LEARNING (SALL)

P R O G R A M

Tuesday, November 28

8:00 - 10:00 p.m. KEYNOTE ADDRESS: Dr. Alan Thomas, Chairman,
Adult Education Department, OISE
and Discussion
Chairman: S. P. Thompson, President, SALL

Wednesday, November 29

9:30 - 10:00 a.m. Registration and coffee

10:00 - 11:50 a.m. PANEL I "What is Cablevision? How It Can Be
Used for Continuing Education and
Community Programs"
Chairman: Barry Robb, Moose Jaw, SALL Council
Gordon Jackson, Manager, AV Services, Regina Campus
Alan Thomas, Adult Education Department, OISE

1:30 - 3:30 p.m. PANEL II "Policy and Regulations Regarding
Educational and Community Programs"
Chairman: Jules Friesen, Saskatoon, SALL Council
Ted Reed, Policy Branch, Province of Saskatchewan
Frank Spiller, Program Branch, CRTC
Graham Spry, Canadian Broadcasting League

3:50 - 5:00 p.m. Display of video equipment and programs

8:00 - 10:00 p.m. PANNEL III "Cablevision for Continuing Education and
Community Programs in Saskatchewan"
Chairman: Betty Pepper, Saskatoon, SALL member
Ron Faris, Chairman, Community College Advisory Committee
Brock Whale, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
Doreen Wahl, Representative from Moose Jaw Community
Cablevision Group

CONFERENCE KEYNOTE ADDRESS

DR. ALAN THOMAS

November 28, 1972

Alan Thomas is the Chairman, Adult Education Department, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. He is a past-Director of the Canadian Association for Adult Education and was Executive Assistant to the Minister of Communications, Ottawa, 1970-71.

CONFERENCE KEYNOTE ADDRESS

DR. ALAN THOMAS

The history of this country is more than anything else the history of efforts human and technical to communicate. If, as someone has observed sometime prior to 1930, all national politics in Canada were railroad politics, then one can observe with equal accuracy that since that time all national politics in Canada have been broadcast politics. If anyone is still searching for some signs of a unique Canadian identity (I believe some people still are), there is more than sufficient to be found in the record of the Canadian response to the problems of communication, a mixture of the nature of their country and the Canadian ingenuity in their temporary solutions. The very construction of our national system is quite unique; for some years we dominated the world in the production and use of documentary film, and in radio drama. We maintain the most extensive television network in the world encompassing as it does five time zones and certainly the largest bilingual broadcasting service. We are the most thoroughly cabled of any country in the world. In the past few years Canadian cable system operators have been employed to build cable systems in a variety of foreign countries—once again we are exporting our technical abilities in this area. One wonders if we'll export the problems as well.

I say all this not only to provide an occasion for us as Canadians to take some private satisfaction in these native efforts and achievements, but also to emphasize the fact that like all societies and individuals we tend to take our most distinctive characteristics for granted. One might point out that the only possible exception to this rule lies in the work and personalities of Harold Innis and Marshall McLuhan, two Canadian scholars who have created quite unique bodies of thought arising entirely out of the Canadian preoccupation with communicating.

If our contribution in the last decade seemed more spectacularly technical than artistic it is in my opinion because the new technology has overwhelmed the rate at which we learn how to use it at least in the public domain. The rate of introduction and innovation is illustrated by two examples of policy decisions taken only 40 years ago that either have recently been reversed or are being considered for reversal.

In the later 1920's both CPR and the CNR operated what are called "phantom" radio stations. Because of their predominance in telegraphy they moved into broadcasting very early. They were assigned wave lengths but their transmitters were on trains and they broadcast from wherever the train happened to be along the national railroad line. In the early 1930's the Canadian government like most governments in the world, for political purposes decided that all transmitters must be fixed in space and abolished phantom stations. There is in fact no technical reason why a transmitter must be fixed since it is of no consequence to the listener where the signal comes from, a fact quite clearly demonstrated by the operation of networks both in radio and television, but there were political reasons. Those of you who are old enough to remember the espionage and spy thrillers of World War 2 will remember the amount of effort and suspense around the attempt to locate a mobile radio transmitter. Just last year the CRTC licensed a mobile transmitter to operate north of Thunder Bay broadcasting to widely scattered Indian communities in Indian languages. Presumably there will be further such licenses awarded since some of our basic assumptions about broadcasting and the protection of the society have changed fundamentally.

In the 20's in the United States the basic battle for pre-eminence in broadcasting was carried out by the telegraph companies and the manufacturers of receiving sets. The telegraph companies - common carriers - argued that just as they were not responsible for the content of any telegrams transmitted on their lines so the broadcast owner should not be held responsible for the content of any or all broadcast messages. The manufacturers, more literate minded perhaps argued that radio broadcasting was publishing and the

same responsibilities that attached to a publisher should be attached to a radio broadcaster. Manufacturers won and in both United States and in Canada the broadcasters are held responsible for the content of broadcasting. Because of the peculiar characteristics of cable this issue is now raised again since the present regulations seem to prevent the effective community use of cable systems. While the report of the Special Committee of the Canadian Senate on the Mass Media is silent on the matter, the report of the Sloan Commission on Cable Communications in the United States is quite explicit in recommending that "the appropriate legislative bodies modify existing laws to remove the liability of the system operator as such for violation of laws concerning liability, incitement to riot, obscenity and the like. Liability would remain for those who program the channels including the system operator himself to the degree that he provides program".

There is some irony that in the present competition between broadcasters and their agencies and the telephone companies - the common carrier - over cable television we are inclined to take the side of the common carriers philosophy which 40 years ago we rejected.

The real question is whether cable is broadcasting and whether it should be treated in the exactly same manner as broadcasting has been in this country. My view is that it is not in most respects despite the similarities and therefore should not be treated in the same way as broadcasting by owners, operators or the public at large. The difficulties involved in making the distinctions that seem to be required are clearly represented by the final statement of the section of the report of the Senate Committee on Mass Media which is entitled the "Cable Conundrum" and which reads: "We feel that the future for cable television in Canada is a bright one. We do not agree with the broadcaster who told us he considers that cable will be obsolete before long. We repeat that it will be difficult to pick the correct path from the inter-weaving possibilities presented by cable television, but we feel that this matter must be pursued and that although finding a solution may be difficult it is none the less possible". While not exactly a confident call to arms, the

statement does reflect the diffidence and discomfort felt by the public domain and it is to the choosing of at least temporarily correct paths from inter-weaving possibilities that we are addressing ourselves in this conference.

What is true is that all of the major issues of our society-private versus public interests, ownership versus control, regionalism versus centralism, language and culture versus economics and technology, a relationship with the United States or continentalism versus nationalism - all of these major issues that have been the pivots of broadcasting issues that those in charge of the evolution of that policy have had to resolve, with the introduction of cable they must be raised and re-examined again. Let us hope that we can bring the same imaginativeness and confidence to this task that has been characteristic of communications policy in Canada.

There are, at present, 361 cable systems in Canada with upwards of a million subscribers. The rate of growth has been remarkable, though not quite as remarkable as the initial spread of radio and television sets. Part of what is reflected in what the Senate Committee Report calls the "Cable Conundrum" may be understood if one reflects that in the first 40 years of its existence, broadcasting was known in many parts of the world as "wireless". Cable, of course, is the reversal of that since transmitters or heads and subscribers are fixed and linked in space. One might recall also, that the earliest radio in Northern and Eastern Europe was all wired and there are characteristics of those systems that might be of some help to us. Exactly what the explicit characteristics of wiredness as opposed to wirelessness are, remained unclear to us and are what we in this country are about to experiment with.

What is at first significant and this is most reflected in the report of the Senate Committee is that cable is seen simply as an extension of broadcasting, a somewhat contentious one at that. This is, of course, the way most innovations revolutionary in consequence are introduced into societies as the extension of something familiar. In my mind, to see it only in that light would be disastrous.

However, there are some aspects of that function that need

some attention. Curiously enough, what is going on here is that we have, at the point of cable head reception, nationalized, by subjecting to domestic regulation, resources that do not belong to us but merely swim in to our territorial domains something like fish in the ocean. From that act flow a good many ironies of control and operation that I don't propose to explore because they seem, in the long term, of minor consequence. Cable will of course replace broadcasting to a degree, a fact signalled by the actions of the Federal Communications Commission in the United States in re-allocating ultra-high frequencies previously reserved for television broadcasting to mobile land transmitter use. They will probably never be recovered. Therefore, what looks now like a minor convenience will, as the spectrum becomes crowded with other uses, become a necessity.

Remaining briefly with cable as an extension or replacement for broadcasting, what is now apparent is that the subscribers' fee simply replaces the old broadcasting licenses fee which Canada eliminated 20 or more years ago. There is a good economic argument for the consumer participating by paying a direct fee except that such a payment bears most heavily on that portion of the population least able to afford it. The benefits of cable television as I see them, like the benefits of ultra-high frequency broadcasting that we debated a few years ago, may therefore be denied to the portion of the population that needs them most. I hope that having assumed public control of cable, a new event in the regionalization of electronic communications in Canada, the government of Saskatchewan will not resort to a kind of state capitalism and overlook the need to subsidize some groups of consumers.

Technically, there are only two characteristics of cable that need to concern us here, first there is the number of channels. Most cable systems in Canada have twelve channels and many are now increasing to twenty. It is quite possible to have forty or more though that is a technical development that belongs sometime in the future. Depending on the region, the number of channels is important only for the number that exists above the demand of transmission of existing broadcast channels. In most cases operators must provide at least one for community use. The other characteristic relates to the number of ways that any specific cable system can be divided up.

There are such possibilities already available for breaking it up into groups defined in various ways for simultaneous transmission. This function is known as "switching" and can permit such variations as remote production, groups communicating to other groups, individuals communicating to source and individuals to individuals. The further along this spectrum you go, that is towards more refined switching the closer you get to a telephone system. This accounts for the interest that the telephone companies show in cable, an interest which goes far beyond the accessibility of their telephone poles for stringing cables. However while I am inclined to support the responsibility consequences of the common carrier argument advanced earlier there is a dangerous consequence of the logic of the telephone companies argument that we should examine. The history of the development of telephone companies has been the expansion of single systems based on arguments of economy of size. It obviously makes little sense to have two telephones on your kitchen wall provided by two different companies. But telephone systems carry different kinds of culture than broadcasting where the economic and political movements have been in quite the opposite direction that is in the rapid development of semi-independent small sources of origination combined into networks on co-operative bases. One might note here the interesting combination of telephone switching with radio in open-line programs, a useful contribution that would not have occurred in my opinion if there had been common ownership. While cable presents the characteristics of a natural monopoly similar to the telephone systems it need not be subject to the same tendency towards the growth of large systems or even the linking of those systems. Indeed if it is to realize its potential it for the time being must not be subject to that logic. The present view of the Senate Committee and the CRTC and the Sloan Commission which fosters local ownership and control must be supported.

I'm dwelling on these technical or structural characteristics rather than on matters of educational content important to adult learning because I believe them to be the most important. Decisions taken now regarding structure and organization will affect any future content educational or otherwise. The Sloan Commission has argued

in fact that in order for cable to be understood as valuable in our educational endeavours it is not simply a matter of adding it to existing procedures but that education must itself re-think its goals and practices. I am convinced that cable television locally organized and operated provides the opportunity of putting the tools of production or of communication in the hands of consumers in at least one area of electronic communication. It advances the prospect of neighbourhoods or small communities understanding themselves and in a way recreating themselves by means of access to the means of being able to talk to themselves and see themselves in a way matched by no other resource available at the present moment. The Sloan Report for example believes that cable television represents an asset of the greatest significance for the revitalization of the inner city which has no comprehensible access to other forms of communication. In the destruction of the producer consumer model which so vitiates both our political and educational system the local use of cable provides the greatest promise. The assertion of public control in Saskatchewan is probably in this province a necessary and useful initial step. It may not necessarily guarantee that this new concept of use of electronic communication will emerge though from what I understand you are going about it in the right way. I'm struck by some important statements in your own report on Community Colleges which I admire very much. In one recommendation you urge the development of a communications network necessary to deliver educational media programs to be rationalized throughout the government and also that community colleges should be used as local mechanisms for educational and community programming in any future cable broadcasting systems in the province. There are a good many imaginative proposals in that report where Community Colleges are seen as functions rather than as places or courses but there is the possibility of conflict between the rather producer-consumer view implied in the first statement and a later statement that a college will be a mechanism to help a community identify to assess its needs as well as those resources human and physical which will help meet those needs. I would suggest that community channels on cable systems will do precisely that provided the grouping of heads and subscribers are

small enough, that effort is spent to provide community development personnel to work in conjunction with each cable system or cable grouping, and provided that people, ordinary people, are helped to learn how to make the technical equipment express their views and feelings about themselves and are provided with reasonable access to time and facilities.

Even when ownership is private and regulated there are interesting indications of this kind of use developing. I am quoting from a recent survey conducted by the CRTC in determining the amount and quality of local programming. Of the 361 cable systems in Canada, 116 or a little less than a third are initiating regular local programming. Of those engaged in that kind of programming, such factors as ownership, population, geography, and culture show no consistent influence. In an analysis of 111 of 116 systems, the following information emerges:

- 67% have full-time paid staff devoted to programming
- 55% have voluntary staff
- 88% have studio and location equipment from the most primitive to highly sophisticated
- 74% were producing programs directed by community people and
- 25% of those allowed the community people to man the equipment for those productions.

Major subject areas in term of frequency were sports, talent dance and music, how to do it, business and hobbies. Sports, talent dance and music and games appeared to be the most popular with the audiences.

Operators were divided in their feeling about these programs with the highest percentage feeling that the material produced by the community was a useful thing to do and another high percentage feeling that the loan of equipment to community groups was the most impractical.

Nearly three quarters provide assistance to groups in the way of consultation, training, and advice.

Some of the remainder of the information indicates that such matters as evaluation of this programming, information about it and genuine community development as a basis for providing it remains

fairly primitive.

It seems to me quite clear that the community or local use of cable television is already emerging as a major trend in the use of this new technology. In my opinion, it would be fatal if concern for the co-ordination of cable networks for the distributing of material over wide areas, how ever well intentioned, were to over-rule or impede this significant community self consciousness. The frequency of references to the strength of vitality of Saskatchewan communities in the report of the Community College suggests that this mode of use would be a natural and important evolution for cable systems. Perhaps it represents the real opportunity for the revitalization of community life in Saskatchewan that was presented and understood so vividly and with such poignancy by Bill Baker and his associates.

In my opinion, then, we must direct our energies in the following ways. First, to the provision of cable systems able to engage in effective community dialogues on a basis manageable in terms of numbers and geography. People define their needs in groups. The existence of an accessible, visible, cable system is a basis for such collective activity and self definition in an entirely new way. My reading of the history of adult learning suggests that the bulk of adult learning has been undertaken by individuals in groups exploring the possibilities of new technologies. Second, the provision of personnel related to those groupings or those cable systems that will help free such energy in those neighbourhoods and communities but will necessarily direct it. This allocation of economic resource seems to me far more important than to put money into the purchase of the impersonal creation of programs. Third, we must provide access to opportunities to learn the skills of communicating with these tools, skills necessary to command the equipment and produce programming that will command attention. Fourth, the release of the owner from responsibility for all programming except on those occasions when he produces it or supplies it. Fifth, the reservation of at least two channels in each system for community use.

While this will reinforce the local and regional interests that are contributing to the precariousness of our national existence at the moment, I remain convinced that this is the true potential of cable and that if we can manage its flowering in time then we can talk of national dialogues or networks provided perhaps by satellites or whatever, and of the possibility of communities speaking with communities across the country. If this happens then such dialogues will be based not only on the technical skill to accomplish it but on the will to do so. In closing, I would like to quote from a remarkable report recently published by UNESCO, entitled, "Learning To Be". It is a result of a survey of all the world's educational systems which by the way concludes that our only hope lies in the elaboration of a system of continuing education and of learning throughout life. In speaking of many of the present views held of the procedures and ambitions of educational systems around the world, the report says, "Some people think that these considerations are permanently valid, that they could have been formulated in other times and that there is consequently no reason to melodramatize the present problem. This is an extremely mistaken view, the situation we are considering is entirely new and has no discoverable precedent. It does not proceed, as is all too often repeated, from simple phenomena of quantitative growth, but from a qualitative transformation affecting man's most profound characteristics and in a manner of speaking renewing his genius". It seems to me that the introduction of cable provides us as a country and Saskatchewan as a province with the opportunity to renew our genius in an area in which we have already indicated some ability, some belief and some remarkable and achievable aspirations.

PANEL I

"WHAT IS CABLEVISION?"

- A Brief Explanation -

GORDON JACKSON

Gordon Jackson is the Manager, A/V Services, University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus. His background includes considerable experience with the CBC in eastern Canada.

WHAT IS CABLEVISION?

Cablevision is simply a delivery system for television, adaptable to existing domestic equipment. Simultaneously the cable system can accommodate many other electronic signals and if certain conditions are met, these signals may travel in opposite directions.

This fact has given rise to the futuristic "wired city" concept which is a technically feasible amalgam of services all combined through the use of coaxial cable for video, data transmission and remote control. When we add suitable terminal equipment, we can distribute the daily newspaper by printing it in home (or office), using facsimile reproduction. The same equipment could yield "hard copy" of anything else it was fed, providing copies of library materials, almost instant letters, weather maps, photos, etc. A terminal to connect with a computer could bring access to computer services at home providing rather a sophisticated system to permit banking services. Remote metering of all metered utilities is possible and, of course, instant, even daily billing against that computer controlled bank account.

The wired city is really a separate issue and is not our immediate interest.

Cablevision, also called CATV (Community Antenna T.V.) occasionally, is a more pressing concern. Already Canada has several CATV systems that are among the largest in the world, in terms of numbers of subscribers, if not in sophistication. Vancouver, Montreal and Toronto are all in the forefront of CATV subscribership.

It all started with the shortcomings of the broadcasting systems. As a simile, consider the very familiar AM Radio Broadcast band. Measured in kilohertz there can be a broadcast channel every 10 kilohertz from 540 to 1640. About 90 channels. These channels are shared by many hundreds of broadcasters on this continent. Most are concerned with serving only their immediate community and the adjacent region, which is only practical. Even with highly directional transmission, at night the AM band becomes a bedlam of interference caused by reflected waves, a familiar phenomenon.

Broadcast television, though subject to little of the reflected skywave phenomenon, suffers from similar interference problems, with a few more problems unique to its higher frequency transmission. These combine to constrain the number and location of broadcast transmitters, even where the potential audience is large enough to support numerous broadcasters.

If we assume that a TV broadcaster can serve an area of some 50 miles in radius (a bit more than the theoretical 35 miles), we would have a coverage pattern that forms a 100 mile circle with the transmission tower in the centre. There would be little problem if this was all they did cover. The signal can't be stopped at that line of fringe reception. Though weakened, it carries on, usually unusable to a receiver, but sufficient to interfere with another signal of the same channel. Broadcasters on the same frequency are usually located more than 200 miles apart.

But that's not all - a strong local signal on an adjacent channel can cause severe interference at the receiver when tuned to a weaker channel. Even a relatively strong signal can be rendered useless in this manner, so adjacent channels are out in any given region (except for 6 and 7 which really are not adjacent, being separated by the FM broadcast band and an additional band for commercial, private and public users such as police, taxis and companies with two way radios).

The location of cities does not necessarily fit the technical requirements of broadcasting, so in any given area usable channels are at a premium.

Further, the location of topographical features such as mountains, valleys, even hills or buildings, complicates the shape of coverage areas even further. For television signals any physical obstruction casts a "shadow", creating "holes" or distortion in the coverage pattern. Increased transmitter height helps overcome this. A high receiving antenna helps too and sometimes an antenna aimed, not at the transmitter, but at the reflector (building or mountain) helps, sometimes!

It was from the fringe or shadow area problem that cable television evolved.

First, groups in shadow areas founded MATV (Master Antenna TV) systems, to pool resources and build a large, high, sensitive antenna in a favourable location on a mountain or building and distribute the signals to their receivers via wires. Apartment owners eliminated early forests of antennas from their buildings by installing "Master" antennas and distribution systems. These MATVs, by using separate, elaborate antennas for each channel and judicious signal boosting and mixing, could supply their customers with good to excellent reception on all channels available in their region.

Homeowners, even in areas of good reception and adequate choice in stations, soon concluded that a similar service would please them. After all, weather (with pollutants) ate away at their expensive antennas. Sleet, snow, wind, did their damage, cutting efficiency, interfering with signals and costing money for every service call to say nothing of the antenna's appearance. Some home buyers agreed not to erect antennas in the purchase contract.

CATV now had a market. To make the service more attractive, some innovative operators added FM music and automatic weather and time via video display, with background music. They became more than antenna services. This was relatively easy to accomplish because, as a technical matter, most strong signals were received on the antenna appropriate for their channel and then were distributed on a different channel to the cable system to minimize interaction with the strong broadcast signal that might cause mischief in the receiver itself. By adding one more modulator and a relatively cheap camera, the cable operator could add his own video for a weather service or even a movie. Besides, there were lots of empty channels.

To the receiver this cable signal was the same as the antenna's signal, but of course it did not have the random strengths of broadcast signals - all channels were now piped through the coaxial cable in equal and consistent strength, boosted at intervals

as necessary. Not all channels could be used without interference and the signals were contained within the cable. If opposite sides of the same street were served by different cables, they could be served different programs.

In addition, this would permit a network station to be assigned to the same channel in all cities. It still could program its own local programming periods. It permits the use of all twelve VHF (Very High Frequency) channels. UHF (Ultra High Frequency) Channels 14 to 80 have a technical problem in that their high frequencies are attenuated rapidly in a cable and the need for frequent amplification increases costs.

Two-way use required some more sophisticated equipment in that the signal amplifiers are essentially one way devices, but by utilizing low frequency modulators and filters, a limited number of reverse direction channels could be available, making the "wired city" concept technically feasible today.

This is the heart of it then, in contrast to broadcasting where channels are scarce and must be allocated to minimize interference, coaxial cable permits the same type of transmitted signals to be conducted, as if in a pipe, to its subscribers without these considerations, making all VHF channels available for programming. As this removes some of the original constraints, it now presents some new legal, political, economic and programming problems!

PANEL II "POLICY AND REGULATIONS REGARDING
EDUCATIONAL AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS"

Ted Reed deals with telecommunication policy development in the Policy and Research Branch, Executive Council, Province of Saskatchewan.

Frank Spiller is Head, Program Branch, of the Canadian Radio and Television Commission, Ottawa.

Graham Spry is President, Canadian Broadcasting League. He and Alan Plaunt initiated the Canadian Radio League in 1930, which fought for an independent public broadcasting system in Canada.

A REVIEW OF PROVINCIAL POLICY

AS OF NOVEMBER, 1972

TED REED

As far back as July 26, 1972, the Government of Saskatchewan, in presenting its position to the Prairie Economic Council meeting in Lloydminster, indicated that the provision of broadband telecommunications services within the province had to be recognized as a provincial prerogative. It took the view that broadband services and systems are more like telephone services and systems than those of broadcasting, and that a provincial broadband cable network should be provided by its common carrier, Saskatchewan Telecommunications in so far as it was economically and technologically appropriate.

The government decided that a network configuration under the control of Sask Tel was the best way to obtain the cross-subsidization required to extend the cable system out of Regina and Saskatoon and into the larger communities on a ten-city plan, thereby bringing broadband communications services to communities which would not otherwise receive them.

The overall concept at that time, as today, was that a broadband cable utility would provide channel capacity or bandwidth on the same rental basis as currently applies to the telephone utility, and that this new broadband cable utility would be government owned. At that time the government was exploring the kinds of services to be offered, and sought maximum flexibility for the social use of broadband cable technology, including the transmission by cable of educational and community program content.

When the Saskatchewan policy on cable television was announced on October 3, the Minister responsible for Communications, Mr. John Brockelbank, said that "in this day and age, freedom of speech also means freedom of access to the mass media, and this government, for one, wants a democratic approach to cable television". He also stated that it was the government's desire to keep the economic and organizational barriers to citizen access to community

cable television at a minimum, and that the way in which the government was trying to achieve this goal was through granting use of the broadband cable utility, as far as the transmission of network and community program content was concerned, only to non-profit, community-controlled organizations.

The Minister did not define what a non-profit, community-controlled organization would be at that time, as it was felt that interested individuals and groups should be afforded the opportunity to have a say about the direction and service the government might provide to develop local community communications through the medium of cable television.

In the weeks following the announcement of policy, a number of eligibility criteria emerged respecting the kinds of community cable organizations which could be granted use of the government-owned hardware system. The Premier stated that although the definition of a non-profit community-controlled organization had not been clearly set, a political party would not be acceptable because membership would have to be open to anyone regardless of political, religious, or other factors. This was the principle of universal community access already enunciated in the earlier policy announcements. The Minister responsible for the cable policy then said that a community cable organization could be any group of citizens interested in television and the local production of cable television programming. He did not think that a community organization existing now would provide cable television, but that it could provide the impetus and leadership necessary to set up a new organization which could specifically concern itself with community cable television.

Other criteria that have emerged include the requirement that the community cable organization be prepared to raise 10% of the capital costs of the community hardware distribution system and that they form a province-wide consortium of community cable operators for ownership, reception and transmission of previously broadcast signals. These two requirements are largely to accommodate

the CRTC which insists on demonstration of financial management capabilities, and on provincial governments not being directly involved in the broadcasting function.

The more general eligibility criterion for use of the government owned hardware system which speaks to the question of federal jurisdiction is that any community cable corporation or co-operative should be properly licensed by the regulatory authority of the Government of Canada in those aspects of their operation coming under federal jurisdiction.

The government still has a number of other eligibility criteria under study, all of which relate to ensuring the democratic character of anybody which would be allowed to interconnect with the broadband cable utility for the purpose of local community communications.

It was hoped that the public, both individuals and groups, would make their views on such matters known to the Minister in charge -- John Brockelbank -- and that ideally, the government could work with a community cable group on questions of structure in which maximum input would come from the people who would eventually be controlling the local cable system, as elected representatives of the community. Because it wishes to give more consideration to the democratic structure of community cable organizations and to minority and majority rights which must be guaranteed to prevent abuse, the Government of Saskatchewan got the Interprovincial Conference of Communications Ministers to cause further study to be undertaken on the legal, economic, and cultural issues surrounding cable television. As part of this process, and in working towards policy guidelines for community cable organizations, the government invites representation from SALL and any other organizations or individuals interested in community cable communications, especially cable programming, through the office of John Brockelbank.

The provincial Cabinet has demonstrated a commitment, in principle, to community communications, far greater than has the Government of Canada through its regulatory body, the CRTC, or the

American Government through the F.C.C. This imaginative concern deserves an equal concern by the people of Saskatchewan, in my opinion, because the failure to do so will reduce the probability of progressive leadership, a quality we need more of, not less.

In general, the Saskatchewan model or policy is a major departure from what we could call the Eastern or American model. In the case of educational television, for example, it would be somewhat illogical for the CRTC to set aside a dedicated channel on behalf of provincial authorities, when there will be an abundance of bandwidth available for leasing by the Minister of Education from the cable utility operated by Saskatchewan Telecommunications. This matter can easily be worked out between these provincial government agencies with no need for CRTC involvement.

In general, we look forward to rethinking the whole area of regulation with representatives of the federal government, in the area of cable television. The new departure in Saskatchewan, being so different from concepts in other jurisdictions, requires a rather imaginative regulatory approach, and provides the federal government with a golden opportunity to reconsider its approach to policy and regulations in the areas of community and education programming.

THE "STATE OF THE ART" OF LOCAL PROGRAMMING
BY CABLE OPERATORS IN CANADA, SUMMER 1972
FRANK SPILLER

It is now some three years since the Commission began to encourage the development of a locally programmed channel.

What has this evolutionary process achieved and what are the future prospects for local programming by cable television systems?

It is necessary to distinguish between local programs that are different in origin and in purpose. COMMUNITY PROGRAMMING is initiated by the community itself whereas LOCAL ORIGINATION is programming initiated by the cable operator.

This distinction is not a value judgement. Community programming is not seen to be better than local origination, but as a different form which comes about spontaneously when the community itself uses the local channel for its own purposes. The existence of community programming will reflect the evolution of natural demand in the community and will therefore, tend to occur more frequently in some situations than in others. In areas where the level of media literacy is fairly high, the uses of the local channel may become identified rapidly. Elsewhere it may take time, or the emergence of a particular problem and the consequent need for community expression, for this to happen.

For cable operators situated in large Metropolitan areas or other media-conscious centres, community programming and access to the local channel is likely to become a major element in their local programming activities. Elsewhere, if there is no expressed need for community programming, they may respond with local origination or other forms of programming. In this way, operators serve each community according to its own unique requirements.

It is possible to state some fundamental characteristics of community programming and local origination which illustrate how it differs from conventional broadcast programming.

Equipment should be as inexpensive as possible, yet capable of providing a certain minimum level of video and sound quality which will ensure comprehension. This presents a new problem--that of determining the minimum acceptable quality of sound and video with lower quality and less expensive equipment rather than trying to use the existing broadcast standards as a model.

The production staff should not look for a large degree of control over the programming process. The more of this process that can be relegated to the community, the closer one comes to the ideal concept of local programming. Such a philosophy places inordinately high demands on the program director. It is not only a question of him being technically competent or able to recognize certain minimum production values and techniques, he has to be able to work with people, to help release their talents. The more his own role fades into the background, the more successful he will be in enhancing the concept of a truly local type programming.

The most natural local programming tends to be unstructured making regular scheduling difficult, yet attempts to copy conventional broadcast programming practices are likely to destroy its spontaneity.

The volume of programming is another critical factor. It is logical that if one sets up a studio facility and acquires a production staff, a cost benefit consideration comes into play and concerns are soon expressed about the output of such a system. Yet merely producing a volume of programming which is not relevant for the community is clearly unsatisfactory. From the cable operator's point of view, he must constantly try and sense the needs, the interests and the problems that are relevant to the people that he is serving. He must remember in particular, that he is capable of serving very finely focussed needs in his community such as communities of interest and neighbourhood communities.

There is little doubt that community programming works well in the small community. There one already finds a "sense" of community, and the local channel is very quickly seen as an opportunity to bring

local issues and events, news and talent, to the people in that community. In the larger centres, the problem is much more difficult because no sense of community exists in the traditional meaning of the word. In such cases, a small audience representing one neighbourhood or a community of interest is more important than random viewers from a general audience.

What about the all-important matter of program control? This does not seem to be a problem. There are community groups who feel that they should have total program control. On the other hand, we have not observed any major problems with the present arrangement under which the final program responsibility rests with the licensee. The issue is, of course, essentially one which involves a human interactive process, that of the interaction between the cable system staff and the community. In some communities, there are more "committed" groups than in others. It is logical, therefore, that if you have the combination of a rather conservative cable licensee and very aggressive groups requiring access to do their own thing, you are going to have potential difficulties. Suffice it to say that no two communities are the same. In some, cable operators find it very difficult to get any kind of local participation, whereas in other cases, very active community groups have formed for the express purpose of utilizing the facilities of the local channel. All of these factors suggest that criteria are needed for local channel use which best reflect the needs of the particular community being served. John Grierson, the founder of the National Film Board, made this observation about trends in film making which apply also to videotape use.

"With cameras coming smaller and lighter and easier to work, cheaper to buy, the decentralization of film making becomes an ever more practical possibility. We see it happening with home movie making in research departments, with teaching organizations who want to make their own films without benefit of clergy".

As the National Film Board's Challenge for Change program has proved, lightweight film and videotape equipment not only places new tools into the hands of the community, it places new demands on the professional media person. Grierson comments: "The substandard film and the videotape are best seen now as relatively simple tools to be locally owned and operated within the context of local reporting, local education and democratic representation at the community level". Grierson comments too on quality:

"The cost of equipment puts the 8 mm revolution within the reach of most groups and associations at least in North America. The professional standards need not be lower than the standards associated with local newspapers when they were making their vital contribution to community building in say, the twenties".

During the last few years the local channel has been the focal point for such pressures and it is interesting to try and assess, in a less philosophical sense, what has actually happened.

There are some 361 cable television systems presently licensed in Canada. Of these, 114 are presently undertaking regular local programming. 59 are located in Ontario, 29 in Quebec, 12 in British Columbia, 5 in Alberta, 3 each in Manitoba and Nova Scotia, 2 in New Brunswick and one in the Yukon.

If we consider only those systems in this group which actually produce their own local programming, that is, those not dependent for their programming on a parent system, some 40 per cent of the total are small, being located in areas where the overall population is under 12,000. This fact is also revealed if the systems are rated by subscriber totals. Over 45 per cent have under 3,500 subscribers.

The 83 programming cable systems covered in our survey produced an average of approximately 18 hours of local programming per week per system. This can be reduced to the three programming groups.

69 systems undertaking Local Origination produced an average per system of approximately 5½ hours original and 2½ hours repeat.

60 systems undertaking Community Programming produced an average per system of approximately 5½ hours original and 2 hours repeat.

59 systems undertaking Other Programming, that is, other than community programming or local origination, produced an average per system of approximately 5½ hours original and 2 hours repeat.

Sampling of Local Origination shows that 70 per cent was produced in the studio of which 17 per cent included film or tape inserts shot on location.

30 per cent was produced completely on location.

These results show that although 67 per cent of the total systems had a local capability, it is still less favoured than the studio. There are undoubtedly valid reasons for this including such factors as equipment breakdowns, and the problems of uncontrollable recording conditions, but it seems most important to break away from the rigidity of studio work if the real life of the community is to be revealed.

It is evident from the facts studied so far that community programming involving initiation of programs by members of the community is a viable form. In general terms, 54 systems undertook some amount of community programming.

All 54 of these did at least 2 hours of community programming during the week. 40 produced between 2 and 5 hours and 25 produced over 5 hours during the week.

Of a sampling of community programming:

26 per cent was made by groups and individuals participating in programs directed and produced by cable television personnel.

49 per cent was made by groups and individuals actually directing programs with the assistance of cable television personnel.

25 per cent was made by groups and individuals who directed and produced the programs themselves and also operated the cable systems' equipment.

A sampling of Other Programming shows that the largest component was bicycled videotapes exchanged between cable systems and the smallest was experimental films.

It seems unfortunate that so little emphasis is placed on new

forms of alternative programming which could involve both new and existing Canadian programs which will not be readily available to audiences from other sources.

The most interesting impressions from the survey are to be found in the newest, most difficult and perhaps the most important aspect of cable television programming, that is the relationship between the community and the cable television system.

There appears to be two key factors involved in the relationship. The willingness of cable operators to accept community involvement and the discovery of methods to achieve practical results.

72 per cent of the operators felt that the major concern of the local channel should be to develop new forms of community expression.

78 per cent agreed that the service on the local channel is best when individuals and groups do most of the programming.

Although programming inexperience is a problem for both community groups and cable operators, it does not appear to be insurmountable. 73 per cent of the systems surveyed indicated that inexperienced groups could generally provide effective programming when given some production help.

72 per cent indicated that they could take on most groups irrespective of their experience and capacity to sustain effective programming.

44 systems are presently allowing groups to use their equipment under supervision and 21 systems are permitting such use without supervision.

There were few contracts or formalized agreements between cable television systems and community groups. 83 per cent of the systems had never made any contracts. 4 per cent had made some in the past, but none at the present time and 13 per cent had contracts in effect at the time of the survey.

74 per cent felt it was feasible to run half-inch tapes although 15 per cent felt it was technically difficult.

The characteristics of groups vary greatly. While most operators

seem to feel that the size of groups is unimportant, most feel that groups tend to underestimate the time and effort required to use audio and video techniques successfully.

The assessment of community needs and the measurement of audience interest is not very sophisticated at the present time. The most frequently used methods of assessing community needs in order of preference are: intuition, knowledge and liaison with groups and the local press.

Audience assessment is also rather primitive and is presently achieved by the following methods in order of preference: conversation, general knowledge, assessing phone calls and written comments.

In principle, cable operators agree that they should provide advice and technical training although in practice, few provide this function.

It is clear that the concept of a local channel is now being accepted by both communities and cable television operators and that a genuine mood of experimentation exists. We must now look for even more innovation in order to further develop and strengthen this concept.

What about the future?

As more and more facilities develop for audiences to gain access to international programming, the more the truly local/local programming function will likely increase in importance. Mass appeal type programming will be even more accessible to viewers because of new technological developments such as satellite distribution systems.

The community, be it a small town or a subcommunity in a large metropolitan area must surely remain the primary focus of cable television programming. The demands from the community for specialized programming, particularly to service minority interests, will probably grow. Under such circumstances, the cable television system can remain a mirror for the community. It is likely to be the one place where individuals can achieve a direct relationship with a hitherto inaccessible communications medium. As life becomes more complex, the need for effective communication becomes ever more critical - not a one-way communication, but two-way involving amateur and professional in a mutually supportive role.

Now to be realistic. How can you really cope with the demand that will be created? Who is to provide the training needed? Who is to provide the resources that are needed? Although the cable television licensee cannot provide all of the resources he will undoubtedly be expected to try and find some solutions. It is he, more than the off-air broadcaster that will be called upon to provide a facility for the community to be itself, to let its hair down, to expose its creative potential, discover its radicals, and face its problems. Yet this role is incredibly difficult. New value systems, new judgements must be rendered in an area where no easy precedents exist to help him.

Yet with all its promise, cable television is a product of an affluent society. It serves a selected part of a community - those that can pay a subscription. This has led many people to observe that those who need its benefits most, the poor and the underprivileged cannot afford it. Irrespective of whether such problems can or will be solved, it is clear that cable television has opened up new perspectives about the role and the responsibilities of the media. It must retain this facility to change and challenge accepted values.

If all these demands are being made on the cable television operator now, there are equally heavy demands likely to be placed on other parts of the community. Other organizations, institutions and agencies must soon come to a determination of their role in bringing about the best use of this newly emerging member of the broadcasting system.

There will probably be more and more indications that facilities must be provided to achieve what is often loosely referred to as a basic visual literacy. There is an educative process involved. If this new, open relationship with the broadcasting medium is to be developed effectively, then people must at least be able to expose themselves to its disciplines.

Videograph in Montreal, an idea which has been developed by the National Film Board's Societe Nouvelle program, gives people a chance to directly access the tools to make programs. They have opened up a store on St. Denis Street in downtown Montreal and invited the public to come in and make videotape programs. The programs are recorded with

port-a-pak equipment, and are then edited on special half-inch editing equipment. Every evening the tapes that are ready for screening are played back over a battery of monitors in a small room at the rear of the store. The public can drop in and view these tapes. The fascinating thing about this is that it gives an immediate facility for people to access videotape equipment and it provides the originators with an evaluative process with a live audience.

There is of course, an important difference between this and the formalized training of people in production techniques for conventional broadcasting. This is a fluid, flexible, hands-on type of training, not hemmed in with all the rigidities of scheduling, of precisely formulated techniques or structures for programs. In general, it is a freer mode of expression and such a means of expression can be used not just for social action, but for creative self-expression in a cultural or artistic sense as well.

All of these developments confront communities across this country with enormous opportunities and incredible challenges. There is no question though, that the cable television licensee in these communities, will have an extremely important role in helping the community find the best use for this facility. Beyond this catalytic function provided by the cable operator is the broader community responsibility - the need to take an inventory of the resources within the community which can be put at the disposal of the community to improve its capability for self-expression. If all of this is approached courageously and not fearfully; responsibly but not restrictively, then it is possible to foresee that exciting possibilities are yet to be explored.

There are other possibilities to be explored as well. Unusual programs such as underground films or unusually interesting materials that are not likely to be available from the mass appeal programming are. There is opportunity for cable television systems to expose potentially talented people to this new medium. This can be a sort of first acquaintanceship if you like with a broadcast medium. Looking to the future, we will need more and more imaginative people to help create Canadian programs. Recognize however, the rather delicate nature of this problem. It may be a question of taking an idea that isn't immediately

accepted, and to try and nurture its development through exposure and through experience on the local channel. If you think this a little far-fetched, there are already cases where ideas that have started on the local cable television channel have been adopted by the over-the-air broadcast media in that same area. The cable television system need not be possessive about its ideas. If they move on to acceptance by others, that's great. This may then pave the way for other people. In a similar vein, the cable television systems should probably worry less in the future about the constancy of groups appearing on their systems. If interest is sustained for only a week or so, this is part of a process, part of the opportunity of moving many people through the experience.

What about the role of the so-called professional media people in this process? As more and more capacity develops in cable television systems, can we not look for new Canadian programming? I have considered the development of the relationship between the community and the local channel as a problem of direct access and interaction. There is also a parallel issue and that is, the availability of professionally produced programs made in Canada by Canadian producers. We have a large number of creative people, we have a well developed film and broadcast industry capable of producing more Canadian materials. Not all of these materials need receive their first or only exposure by off-air television systems. The cable television system can provide unique opportunities for specialized programming, that is limited appeal programming for various communities of interest within the larger community served by mass appeal programming. With large corporations re-examining their role in a public context, the opportunity might now exist for new forms of financial support for Canadian produced programs. It is interesting to remember that much of the pioneering work in the documentary film was aided and directly supported by large corporations.

This again represents a good example of the broadening of the base of this challenge. It is not only a challenge to the cable operator to be a catalyst, but it is also a challenge to people who can produce materials, who can sponsor them and who own finished materials, to make them more available for public enjoyment and enlightenment through the facilities of cable television.

There are obvious things that the future will bring - more channel capacity, more facilities for two-way systems. Much of this is still far off into the future and yet we can experiment with forms of interactive television already and as many cable systems have found out, the phone-in type show has a tremendous impact and is extremely effective in terms of local citizen involvement.

It seems that local programming is coming of age. We can now identify its form, describe its characteristics, visualize its future. There are enormous opportunities yet to be exploited in cable television programming in Canada as well as part of the overall broadcasting system. We have a rich array of resources and we should use them. We have great opportunities to improve communication amongst people and to reduce the destructive effects of alienation. We do not need to look, nor in a sense can we look, to other countries for precedents because we are in the precedent-setting position.

What is really so different about cable television? Perhaps two possibilities stand out clearly at this time.

The facility to provide people with a new association with the media.

The potential to break away from mass appeal programming.

The first is clearly a local matter for the cable licensee and the community.

The second involves the cable licensee and the professional program producer.

Both represent exciting new concepts.

BROADCASTING: FOR WHOSE BENEFIT?

GRAHAM SPRY

It is not within my competence to discuss in detail or with professional knowledge this complex subject. I leave, therefore, education to the educationalists and regulations to the regulators who adorn this panel, and will take as my part of this discussion some considerations of policy, essentially relevant but more general than particular, more background than foreground or foresight.

Canada has entered an era of very testing relations both in trade and communications with the United States and it is more than probable that Canada may be caught and, indeed, perhaps squeezed between the massive economic power of our American neighbours and the rapidly rising power of the European Economic Community.

In the emerging situation, Canada's stature, identity and vulnerability may well be increasingly at stake.

I COMMUNICATIONS IS COMMUNITY

In this possible and probable event, nothing is more weighty and significant in realizing our perhaps uncertain destiny than communications and information which shape our public opinion and education, shape our people, adults as well as the young, in this community of Canadians.

Especially is it significant in the life of a highly vulnerable society, such as Canada. Canada's old association with and re-enforcement from Europe are more and more foresaken or truncated or reduced. The dependence upon predominant continental connections is increasing. The basic east-west axis of nationhood, which the canoe, canals, Confederation and the CPR confirmed, is under challenge by the powerful technological and corporation influences, including even the CPR chairman's sympathy for continental economic north-south associations.¹

The purpose of these observations is to insist that communication is not an event external to or merely a re-enforcement of the

structure of a human being or a human society. On the contrary, it is an essential constituent of man and of society,² and it sets limits to the coherence and extent of a society. It measures its activity or decline. It also measures the autonomy of its responses and decisions.

Dr. Colin Cherry: "What is communication? It is the substance of all social life. I would define a society as a people in communication . . . a social group, of any kind, exists only inasmuch as its members communicate".³

Norbert Wiener: "Properly speaking the community extends only so far as there extends an effectual transmission of information. It is possible to give a sort of measure to this by comparing the number of decisions entering a group from outside with the number of decisions made in the group".⁴ "Organism is seen as message Organism is opposed to chaos, to disintegration, to death, as message is to noise".⁵

Karl W. Deutsch: "Processes of communication are the basis of the coherence of societies, cultures and even of the personalities of individuals Membership in a people essentially consists in wide complementarity of Social Communication".⁶

II COMMUNICATIONS IN THE CANADIAN EXPERIENCE

A rapid sketch and consideration of the stages in broadcasting which determined the structure, the great and complex system we now enjoy in Canada, is here attempted.

By 1920, radio broadcasting had begun in Montreal and this majestic instrument for distributing information was ready to our hands. Sporadic, isolated, small, and usually ill-financed private expansion followed. But 12 years later only 66 stations, most of them of 5 and 25 watts power, were operating. Their combined power in the whole of Canada was about that of single stations in several American cities. Such networking as we had occupied 30 to 60 minutes a day. The average time on the air of all stations was about 6 hours a day.

Canada as a national community was slow in recognizing a great national and provincial opportunity. Parliament failed promptly to respond, or to formulate a national policy for the full use of this supremely effective instrument of entertainment, information and education. There was delay, indecision, and inaction. Private enterprise, except in the largest cities, was in no position to meet the needs the scattered audiences felt and they overwhelmingly depended upon American broadcasts.

At least two provinces, Manitoba and Alberta, acted imaginatively but it was not, however, until 1932 and 1936, 12 or 15 years later than European and many other countries had adopted policies, that Parliament unanimously or almost unanimously passed two Acts designed to create a nation-wide system and coverage. These Acts provided for one, a coast-to-coast network of high-powered stations in public ownership and two, for numerous privately-owned, low-powered stations for local and community services.

Both these Acts included the power to nationalize all broadcasting and set up a monopoly as the Aird Commission of 1929 had recommended. Monopoly, however, was neither the objective nor mandatory in the statutes nor, I am sure, the will of public opinion and the numerous major national voluntary organizations which expressed that opinion.

The objectives were, I repeat, first, a coast-to-coast high-powered network financed by the audience, that is by license fees for receiving sets without a Government subsidy and, second, more and more local, community stations in private, municipal or indeed co-operative ownership. In 1932, for example, a witness proposed to the House of Commons Committee that 150 additional private stations for local community service be licensed.

Much detail and much vigorous in-fighting are passed by in these statements. But some vital principles, with both a national or local significance and a fundamental bearing upon the broadly national and broadly educational purposes of radio broadcasting, can be summarily emphasized.

(1) The nation-wide system, the CBC, was to be a public system as distinct from a state system. Beyond responsibility to Parliament, the operating authority was to be a voluntary Board of Governors representing in no measure the party in power but the public and, in particular, the audiences. For this, among other reasons, the first Act of 1932 was attacked by its critics as too close to Government, and a voluntary board of independent, representative citizens on the model of British and other systems was adopted by the Government of Mackenzie King in 1936. For the same reason the Aird proposal of Government finance from tax revenues to supplement license revenues was not included in the Acts of 1932 or 1936.

The audience, not taxation, was to finance the public system. In fact, between 1932-33 and 1951, about twenty years, license fees paid by the audiences and some advertising financed the public system without Government revenues: a radio network was created and operated some sixteen hours a day from coast to coast. Until television arrived, those twenty years showed a net revenue, a profit. Cable systems, still more generously, are financed by the subscriptions or, if you will, by monthly license fees. Finance by the audience has proved practicable.

(2) A second principle, alike for the public and private sectors, was that broadcasting was a public service and not mainly an industry or business. The parallel, though not the exact model, was the British and other public systems in democratic countries of Europe and elsewhere, rather than the commercial system of the United States.

(3) A further and urgent principle was that no one section of the public --- a religion, a political party, a railway, a bank, brokerage or other financial groups, any single interest, should own or operate or use for their own sectional purposes --- the broadcasting system. The system was to be a public system operated for diverse interests and the whole of Canada. The only single final authority was to be the Parliament elected by the Canadian people and the operating or regulatory bodies set up by and responsible to that Parliament ---

Parliament, be it noted, and not the Government of the day, or the civil service.

(4) There were other principles --- a due but not exclusive volume of Canadian programmes, a Board of Governors or directors generally representative of Canada, restricted interference with programmes by excessive advertising, no attacks upon one religion by another, high technical standards, provision for both formal and general education in co-operation with the provinces, and the actual day-to-day operation of broadcasting by broadcasters of experience and quality under the autonomous Board of Governors.

These principles were set out in the Acts of 40 years ago and though modified in detail, sometimes wisely, sometimes unwisely, these principles were respected in the later Acts of 1958 and 1968. Parliament, usually almost unanimously, defined and willed the ends but step by step it changed the structure, the financing and, in a measure, narrowed the distance between the Government of the day and the broadcasters, public and private.

And it failed to authorize a \$3.00 license fee --- the fee was first set at \$2.00 --- thereby upsetting the carefully prepared financial plan for building stations and creating adequate Canadian programming.

To balance this implied criticism, let it be said with satisfaction that much was accomplished and the Canadian system is in the extent of its coverage and the volume of its hours on the air, one of the largest in the world.

But there were also these results. First, the nation-wide, publicly-owned system covering Canada was not completed and was made largely dependent upon increasingly more numerous private affiliates to complete CBC coverage. These affiliates use only a percentage of CBC-TV programmes and a still smaller percentage of CBC radio programmes.

Second, the financing of the CBC has been transferred from the audience to the taxpayers and a vital degree of CBC independence of the Government of the day has been reduced.

Moreover, Committees and Commissions have pressed the CBC to increase its advertising revenue and thereby increased in periods of peak audience the influence of advertisers upon programmes. Recently, also, the CBC Board of Directors has come to include civil servants --- three or so --- rather than ordinary citizens free to represent the Canadian people and their will, rather than the will or casual influence of some Government department.

Third, the CBC has been increasingly required to use its funds for purposes which departments of the Government should meet or share --- the international service, the armed forces service, the emergency service, an undue portion of the satellite costs and, indeed, the bilingual policy --- which as a principle I heartily endorse --- is wholly carried in broadcasting revenues of the CBC instead of by a special appropriation. Figures are difficult to come by but I boldly suggest that too often the burdens laid more and more on the CBC impinge upon and almost certainly reduce the percentage of total revenues left over for programmes and the development of Canadian talent.

Other limitations placed on the CBC could be referred to --- almost the whole cost of network distribution from coast to coast, for example, some \$20 million a year --- is carried to, say, 80 or even 90 percent by the CBC budget.

But perhaps the most serious result over the years is that whereas the CBC was to be the central and primary sector, it has, for many reasons, including political pressures, licensing practices, the power of business interests, and now the multiplication of cable systems, become much the smaller sector when the numbers of CBC owned and privately owned broadcasting units --- radio, television or cable --- are compared.

That is, the public service sector has been, in effect, held back and the private sector given more and more authority to expand and in a measure to dominate. This trend will accelerate as cable systems multiply. It is, of course, right that cable should expand but let us realize that 400 cable headends mean say, three further American channels and, by CRTC permission, create in effect 1200 American re-broadcasting stations on Canadian soil. This, as the CRTC has repeatedly said, threatens the survival of the Canadian broadcasting system and the existence

of private stations, their audiences and their advertising revenues. I use Mr. Juneau's words in Time of July 17, 1971: The expansion of cable endangers the existence of Canadian broadcasting and the creation of Canadian programmes.

These are questions of fact and not in any measure whatever are they implied suggestions for restricting or excluding American or other non-Canadian programmes from Canadian listeners or viewers. That would be a sorry policy of negation.

What we need is a positive, vigorous and imaginative policy of improving, developing and promoting Canadian competition through Canadian programming, adequately advertised and promoted.

This will cost money. But it will cost only that money which we will be spending one way or another upon broadcasting. The present method of financing private broadcasting over stations or cable will make fortunes rather than programmes, and lead rapidly to control by a few powerful businessmen in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver of this great instrument of public opinion and education.

As for the CBC, it will in most cable communities have one, or with French two, channels among 10 or 20, while millions are spent on private operations. Yet CBC still will have to make its annual "hat in hand" procession to the Government for finance, not so much to keep itself functioning but also to help keep alive its scores of privately-owned affiliates through giving them free programmes, free network and free technical services.

Broadcasting --- stations and networks only --- cost some \$500 million a year. Operating receiving sets in the home or elsewhere cost at least that or perhaps double it. By 1980, the broadcasting figure will, at 1969 dollars, cost on two official estimates \$750 to \$1000 millions. A broker's published estimate cites the revenue of cable systems at one billion plus in 1980.

All this money will necessarily come from the audience, member by member. How much of this will go to programmes, to musicians, actors, writers and performers generally? And how much to the investors

and financial houses and to perhaps excessive or even duplicated "hardware"? And how much for life-long learning, for other education and for Canadian film, slides, cassettes, lasers and other new communications? And, above all, who will determine the purposes, character and national origins of this huge volume of information in all its forms?

The present trends are, to my mind, not happy trends for a people determined to express its own public opinion and make its own free decisions. The driving forces at work in meeting broadcasting needs and the opportunities of new technologies are not public policies decided by Parliament, but by increasingly concentrated and centralized businesses. Increasingly, also, the Canadian audiences are being incorporated in American audiences and through advertising, Canadian consumers incorporated in a continental American market. The Davey Report on Mass Media, the private and governmental studies of business and trade amply confirm these conclusions.

The trend, the palpable fact, is that we are losing control by the public and Parliament of the instruments of information, entertainment and education. The fact is that the logic of financing of Canadian broadcasting is wrong and renders difficult, inadequate and inefficient, the right uses and high purposes broadcasting should serve. A whole new, independent and imaginative examination of how the money we provide is used is again necessary. Equally and urgently, public concern and public action, expressed through an active, alert and challenging public opinion, are immediate and paramount necessities.

We must wake up to what is happening to this nation. The conclusion poses these simple questions: Are we Canadians? Do we insist on continuing to be Canadians? Will we organize our great resources in broadcasting and create a vigorous policy that preserves and strengthens Canada?

REFERENCES

- 1 N. R. Crump. Address to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian manufacturers Association, Toronto, 7 June, 1971. Mr. Crump believes in "a cohesive federal power", constitutional changes "further strengthening . . . the relative power of the provinces vis-a-vis Ottawa" and consideration of the question of how far the "structure of our East-West economic alignment" should be re-oriented, for example fuller integration of Quebec and Ontario "into the heartland of North America".
- 2 The definition of society and community vary with writers and between disciplines. Here, both terms are used as sufficiently meaning an organization of men.
- 3 Journal of the Royal Society of Arts. Dr. Colin Cherry, Professor of Telecommunications, Imperial College of Science, London. London, February, 1966. Pp. 160-161.
- 4 Cybernetics. Norbert Wiener, Professor of Mathematics, M.I.T. M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1965. Pp. 157-158.
- 5 Ibid, p. 95
- 6 Nationalism and Social Communication. Karl W. Deutsch, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1953. Pp. 60-67, 71, 80 and 141.

PANEL III "CABLEVISION FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
and COMMUNITY PROGRAMS IN SASKATCHEWAN"

Ron Faris is Head, General Studies Division, Department of Extension, University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus. Dr. Faris was Chairman of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Community Colleges, and has produced educational television and radio series in Saskatchewan.

Brock Whale is Assistant Director, Extension Division, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon. Dr. Whale is presently producing a tele-lecture series for use in off campus credit courses.

Doreen Wahl is an active member of a Moose Jaw citizen's group interested in the community use of cablevision. She has been a Superintendent of the local Canadian Mental Health Association office in Moose Jaw.

CABLEVISION, COMMUNITY COLLEGE
AND LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT - A VIEWPOINT

RON FARIS

Today I wish to explore four areas of concern regarding the development of Cablevision for Continuing Education and Community programs in the Province of Saskatchewan. The first is a need for the development of provincial policy which views the use of cablevision for educational and community purposes as an integral part of a wider communication and media system. The second concern is to clarify the purposes for which media generally and cablevision specifically will be used in the adult education enterprise - a topic which fellow panelist Brock Whale will explore in more detail. The third is an attempt to speculate on how a community college might relate to a community owned cablevision operation. The fourth concern is related to future developments in the field and how several institutions with national responsibilities might respond to the development of a socially owned cablevision system in Saskatchewan.

Development of Integrated Policy

I submit that the Provincial Government must attempt to relate policy development in four key fields: telecommunication, educational media, community colleges, and libraries. I believe that only when policy and institutional development in these complex and costly areas are integrated can a system capable of meeting the learning needs of Saskatchewan citizens be most effectively developed. I now wish to sketch the bare bones of policy in these fields and deal with some of the more important implications and inter-relationships as I see them.

The Minister responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications has announced that that crown corporation will develop a microwave system connecting ten cities of Saskatchewan and will lay all cable in the province. This public utility approach, with its built-in subsidization for unprofitable smaller centres was welcomed by those concerned about the provision of greater choice for citizens living outside our two largest cities. A further policy leaves non-profit corporations

or community co-operatives as the local cable operators and thus provides a means whereby co-op surpluses may be ploughed back for local programming purposes. Thus the two major complaints of educators and community workers in those parts of Canada where private cable operators have functioned - lack of service to sizeable yet unprofitable centres, and provision of little or no funds for community programming - have hopefully been answered in a positive way.

A major decision must soon be made as to what kind of provincial structure will be used for the production of educational media. Two facts of life which any future agency must face are clear, however. First, many government departments besides those of Education have public education programs and second, certain programs of province-wide interest could best be produced by a central agency while other programs of a purely regional nature might properly be produced by a regional cable studio. The Department of Continuing Education has begun to assess existing production facilities in the province. Hopefully, rational and bold decisions in the near future will prevent the multi-million dollar mistakes which several other provinces have already made in regard to incompatible equipment and duplicated facilities.

The Department of Continuing Education has already begun to act upon recommendations of the Minister's Committee on Community Colleges. By next fall four pilot projects will be testing the effectiveness of the co-ordinating and facilitating roles of these unique colleges. Through the experience gained in using techniques of need assessment and resource identification skilled community education teams will be available in many regions of the province.

Community education workers could, initially in the urban and later in the rural communities, act as a sensing mechanism for identifying and evaluating program needs. These workers would hopefully act as the initial animators so often necessary to encourage people who feel incapable of expressing their concerns on a medium they previously considered to be the domain of "experts". The effects of de-mystifying and democratizing the media in a province which is essentially dominated by several media monopolies will be of real interest.

The recent recommendations of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Community Colleges regarding library development was well received by those in that field. The report recommended that the present regional library system act as the library system for community colleges, and further that serious consideration be given to use of the provincial library network as a media distribution system.

Clarification of Purposes

One doesn't have to work very long in the media field to find that there are a substantial number of people engaged in this area given to excessive use of jargon and exaggerated claims regarding the effectiveness of media for educational and community purposes. There can be a gimmickry and a "fadishness" which reaches heights seldom attained in any other field. In order to leave this conference in reasonable physical condition I hasten to add that no such individuals or fads exist in this province. Seriously, we as individuals, and hopefully as a province, will get down to the serious consideration of the purposes to which the media generally, and cablevision specifically, will be put. Frankly my position is, that a prime concern in designing a province-wide media system must be the meeting of the continuing learning needs of the people of this province, and that special consideration must be given to how the less favoured - those in rural areas and those of lower social economic status - may also benefit.

Possible Community College-Library Relations

While I have discussed general policy concerns I have not dealt with how the cablevision system might be used by a community college. To be specific, I would see a local cablevision system being operated by a community co-operative. Such a co-op would hopefully gain initial organizational and financial assistance from the Department of Co-operatives and Co-operative Development and receive technical assistance regarding studios and equipment from Sask-Tel. This community co-op would have ultimate responsibility for the operation of the local community cable studio, its management and program policy.

Such a co-op might delegate responsibility for continuing

education programming to the local community college council. This council would have an expanded sub-committee on community media, which would bear responsibility for continuing education programming in the college region. College community education workers would assist people in the local community in regards to 1. need assessment 2. use of video equipment 3. program design 4. program evaluation and feed back. It is of interest that in no other province have community colleges been related to local community cablevision systems in this way.

The regional library branch would be used by the community as their college library. It would contain a union catalogue of video tapes and films as well as video and film playback equipment. Just as one can order a book via interlibrary loan, so one could order, for instance, video cassettes to meet his individual learning needs. Major regional branches would be linked by cable so that one might gain instant access to material which could be shown via video and reproduced on demand. Thus many people in rural centres would have the same opportunity to gain information as those who live in the largest urban centres.

I have urged an integrated policy development in the field of telecommunication, educational media, community colleges and libraries. I have also urged that we discuss which bodies will develop complex and expensive systems in these fields, and more important, the purposes for which these systems will be built. I have attempted to operationalize how a community college and its library might relate to a cable system, however there are many questions yet to be answered and problems to be solved. I want to share a number of concerns I have in regards to future development in these fields.

Future Developments

The first is that economic and technological concerns have predominated in the development of these four fields in many other provinces. Frankly, my major concern is not about hardware or equipment, but rather about the software or programs. I feel, with apologies to McLuhan, that what we say and why we say it is as important as the means

by which we say it. I believe we have in this province an opportunity to develop a reasonably integrated provincial system, far less fragmented than many other provinces. I hope that we can keep foremost a determination to serve those in rural areas and that economic and technological concerns will be focussed on how we can break out of the microwave-cable system to serve those in sparsely populated regions.

The second concern is expressed in the recent report of the Worth Commission in Alberta, to quote: "The present definition of educational broadcasting, by which educational radio and television must abide is thought by some to be an unnecessary and debilitating imposition... some educational broadcasters advocate a new definition that would operate by exclusion rather than inclusion. These broadcasters suggest that it would be easier and more sensible for the federal government to identify what educational broadcasting could not be rather than what it should be". I share this concern, and especially when we attempt to define and distinguish between educational broadcasting for continuing education and for community programs. Those of us who are more concerned with learning than with "education" must challenge those who would restrict and compartmentalize for narrow objectives and purposes.

A third concern is about the future of educational programming on the major national networks. It appears to me that over the last twenty years a Gresham's law of the media has been operating whereby bad programming has too often driven out good programming with real learning potential. Will the CBC and the CTV argue as more provinces have their own educational television channels that there is even less reason for them to bolster their essentially feeble educational efforts? Thirty years ago, Canada through its Farm and Citizen's Forum led the world in educational broadcasting. This was a type of broadcasting that attempted to not only be relevant but also to meet the need for two-way communication. In the last decade we have marched backwards.

A fourth concern is related to the operation of the community co-operatives. While such a mechanism would hopefully provide not only citizen's access to equipment and expertise but also an opportunity for non-elite minority groups to express their views, there is at present

no guarantee that minority ethnic, cultural, religious or political groups would be treated fairly. I therefore urge the provincial government to develop legislation for a media Bill of Rights which would assure all groups of reasonable access to the community program channel. It would be a Magna Carta for a multicultural province such as ours.

I feel such a Bill of Rights would serve several functions. First, it would make it perfectly clear to all citizens, regardless of beliefs, that they have a right of access to the community program channels in this province. Second, it hopefully would cause the other provinces and the CRTC to consider similar legislation and put an end to the interference with a basic civil liberty which has been experienced in several eastern centres with private cablevision operations. Community co-operatives, because of their democratic, community-based structure have a greater potential for responsiveness to community needs than has been found in many of the eastern private operations. Once again, Saskatchewan can lead in the development of new ways to meet human needs.

A final concern has already been expressed by the Saskatchewan Association for Lifelong Learning. It deals with the present CRTC policy of holding hearings for licence applications in a series of regional meetings at which, for instance, applications for a Saskatchewan centre could be heard in Victoria, or Toronto. SALL's position, which I support, is that hearings for Saskatchewan licence applications should be held in Saskatchewan so that interested citizens may fully participate. I feel that such a suggestion is just another small way in which federal authorities can become more responsive to the needs and wishes of Canadians in various regions.

Let us be very clear in this province, cablevision must be used for more than selling the products of American and Eastern manufacturers. It will hopefully be another means by which the people of this province can discuss and affect their personal and community's future.

CABLEVISION FOR LEARNING
AND UNIVERSITY EXTENSION
BROCK WHALE

My remarks as a member of this panel are made from two distinct points of view that should perhaps be described. The first is my personal view about the kind of educational opportunity we ought to dream about for the future. The second is my point of view of how University Extension programs fit into that dream.

For me, the greatest single need within the educational system is to find a means to help a person connect "learning" and "doing". We have tended to treat education as though there is a period of time in our lives that must be devoted to "learning" and that period of time must precede the period of time in our lives that must be devoted to "doing". That may have been all right when there was a limit to what was available to learn; and when knowledge wasn't going out of date so quickly.

The idea of combining "learning" and "doing" is by no means new. It was fundamental to the ancient apprenticeship systems. Yet it is not a return to an apprenticeship system that I would propose as one approach to the present educational dilemma. With the total amount of knowledge available in any subject area, it seems impractical to believe that a person can learn it all before he puts some of it into practice. Further, with the speed that new knowledge is discovered, it is predictable that a person during his lifetime will have considerable to learn to keep from becoming obsolete. Somehow, in order to make use of the knowledge available, a person must learn to recognize when he needs new knowledge. He must have access to knowledge resources. In short, he needs to accept responsibility for setting his own learning objectives and for seeking out and utilizing the educational resources needed to achieve his objectives. That would mean, of course, that the educational resources be made available to allow a person to pursue what amounts to independent study.

It does not require a great mental leap to fit cablevision into that kind of context. If all persons were to set their own learning

objectives it would mean that, in the province of Saskatchewan, there would be close to a million different objectives to receive attention one way or another. Where you can get 20-30 people in the same place with similar objectives, it would be possible to help them achieve their objectives in the traditional way--by organizing a class. If the 20-30 people with similar objectives are scattered over a wide geographic area, television, radio, or some combination of use of media holds some promise. Of course, if there is only one person in a community with a specific learning objective, it may be necessary that resources be provided him on an individualistic basis through the local library or through some other means of distribution.

So, I see cablevision, or any form of mass communication, as one means by which knowledge can be distributed to those who are pursuing a style of life that includes learning throughout their lifetime. It will allow some to have their learning objectives to be met within their own homes.

For such a thing to happen will require more than having the equipment available. Programs that are designed to stimulate learning will have to be produced for transmission through the cable outlets. I would hope, for instance, that University subject matter could be effectively presented using the medium so that people can take subjects for credit towards a degree; or subjects that they are interested in to help them gain greater satisfaction from what they're doing. This will require a different approach to the extension function than we are accustomed to. It will also require that people look upon television as a valid learning medium rather than as only an entertainment medium.

Cablevision should also allow the "learning" and "doing" connection to be made within all of the roles a person performs in his lifetime. Our current educational system places emphasis on preparation for the work role. Yet a person spends less than a third of his time working. Subject matter that can help a person gain greater satisfaction from performance of such roles as parent, homeowner, member of a voluntary organization, and community leader could be made

available through use of the media. The manner of presentation of information will require careful consideration. Often people accept as educational only those situations where a recognized authority, a teacher, or a professor is presenting the facts in a sophisticated setting. There is so much to be learned about our own communities from the person next door. And yet we bypass opportunities for such learning because it is not presented by a person we accept as an authority. Here is another area I would hope the University might work-- to help people look at their own communities, for information about their communities that would help them gain greater satisfaction from living there and to share their findings through such a medium as cablevision.

There is a great variation of opinion right now about the quality of production necessary to attract people's attention on a medium such as cablevision. I hope we don't get "hung up" on this to a point where community groups feel they are excluded from using the medium for lack of sophistication. The label of "crap" is being placed on much of what is produced on commercial television. Though the term "crap" has not been too carefully defined, it would appear that it is being applied in reference to content rather than to production technique. Our own studies, thus far, suggest that when people find the content of interest or value they will put up with very mediocre production quality. We must continue to research this point but my own view is that there is a lot of effective learning to be accomplished by community groups with videotape equipment and a medium like cablevision by which to share their amateur productions.

Of course, for this potential to be realized community groups that would use cablevision will need to understand the medium well enough to know its limitations, and their own limitations in using it. If attempts are made to compete with commercial television with entertainment content, the amateur productions will predictably come out second best. What is more, a primary potential of cablevision for presentation of locally produced content of critical consequence to the local scene will not be realized.

CABLEVISION FOR MOOSE JAW
A COMMUNITY CONCERN

DOREEN WAHL

There were several factors which initiated the formation of the Moose Jaw Community Channel Committee in September of 1971. Notable among these factors were queries about cable television from members of the Canadian Forces Base, the interest of the Economic Development Commission, knowledgeable support from instructors at the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, and a communication facilitator, Mr. Roy Wagner, of the University of Saskatchewan, Extension Department. Soon several citizens became interested in the Cable Television talk and with the support of the local news media the group made arrangements to meet with known cable applicants. Subsequently Western Coded Television, Edmonton; Co-ax Television, Estevan and Prairie Cable (Sask.) Ltd., Regina, representatives presented their companies policies regarding services and community programming, to local public meetings. In evaluating this information the citizens group decided that much groundwork would have to be done if this community were to derive any benefits from cable television.

Never before had a group of citizens attempted to get involved in community programming and other aspects of cable television before a license was granted for cablecasting. In December a Steering Committee was appointed and given the specific task of continuing education of all segments of the community. To facilitate this a Public Forum was planned, to promote community programming, community concerns and to actively involve citizens in conversation with people from the "communication field". Financially the committee was assisted by a Citizenship Development grant from the Department of the Secretary of State, Ottawa.

The Forum was held on April 12, 1972 at the Moose Jaw Union Centre. Resource people and invited guests included representatives from:

1. National Film Board, Montreal.
2. Canadian Radio and Television Commission.

3. Federal, Provincial and Civic governments.
4. Cable Television applicants.
5. Coded-Vision applicant.
6. Community College Committee.
7. Community Media Co-op, Edmonton.
8. Calgary Cable TV (program planner).

The objectives of the Forum were:

1. To create an interest in community programming.
2. To provide an interest in communication at all levels of community life.
3. To provide the nucleus for the formation of a viable organization to guide and govern community programming.
4. To indicate an interest in future plans for a training session covering the use of equipment for TV programming.

Attendance of individual citizens, at the Forum, was less than anticipated, however the representation from organized groups was good. Other areas of the province indicated strong interest with people attending from Regina, Saskatoon, Swift Current, Radville, Yorkton, Weyburn and several Moose Jaw rural areas.

In evaluating the Forum, the committee concluded there were several areas of local concern such as:

1. Would rural areas have access to cable service?
2. Some technical excellence in equipment is necessary if community programming is to succeed.
3. CRTC Hearings are often out of reach to the average citizen, due to location of hearings and expenses involved.
4. The formation of a local governing board is essential to community programming.
5. Communication between the cable operator and members of the community is vital.
6. Development of local interest is a continuing process.
7. Present television outlets do not satisfy the community needs.

8. Most citizens are interested in additional programs from United States channels, not community programs.

Contrary to reports you have read in newspapers this fall we, in Moose Jaw, are not ready to begin cablecasting. We do feel however, that we have accomplished a good deal in our efforts to inform the public about community programming. With the co-operation of the news media many concerns regarding cable television and community programming have reached the individual citizen in a much more relevant form than most communities have experience.

The committee is presently attempting to set up a training session for those interested in using VTR equipment. We feel that this type of learning experience is necessary to assist the average person to overcome the feeling that only experts should get involved. Community programming must reach all segments of the community, provide for community discussion and promote citizen involvement.

The committee is grateful for the support of the National Film Board "Challenge for Change" program and the able assistance of Mr. Wagner.

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED AT CONFERENCE

BOARD OF EDUCATION Adult Education Section	Regina
CO-OPERATIVE INSURANCE SERVICES	Regina
COMMUNITY HEALTH FEDERATION	Saskatoon
ESTEVAN SCHOOL UNIT #2	Estevan
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS	Regina, Saskatoon
DEPARTMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION	Regina
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	
- Instructional Resources Section	Regina
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH	Regina
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES	Regina
HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AGENCY	Regina
MELVILLE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL	
- Adult Education Section	Melville
MOOSE JAW CABLEVISION COMMITTEE	Moose Jaw
NATIONAL FILM BOARD OF CANADA	Regina
PRINCE ALBERT REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE	Prince Albert
PROVINCIAL LIBRARY	Regina
REGINA PUBLIC LIBRARY	Regina
REGINA SEPARATE HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	Regina
SASKATOON FAMILY SERVICE	
- Children's T.V. Committee	Saskatoon
SASKATOON PUBLIC LIBRARY	Saskatoon
SASKATCHEWAN ARTS BOARD	Regina
SASKATCHEWAN ASSOCIATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS	Regina
SASKATCHEWAN CO-OP CREDIT SOCIETY	Regina
SASKATCHEWAN CO-OP WOMEN'S GUILD	Leroy
SASKATCHEWAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION	Regina
SASKATCHEWAN INSTITUTE OF APPLIED ARTS & SCIENCE	Regina, Saskatoon
SASKATCHEWAN TECHNICAL INSTITUTE	Moose Jaw
SASK-TEL	Regina
SASKATCHEWAN WHEAT POOL	
- Extension Division	Regina
- Personnel & Organization	
SASKATCHEWAN WOMEN'S INSTITUTE	Torquay
ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE	Yorkton
UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN	
- Audio Visual Services	Saskatoon
- Extension Division	Saskatoon
- Department of Extension	Regina
- School of Social Work	Regina
UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S CLUB Audio-Visual Services	Regina
YORKTON REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL	Yorkton

ERIC Clearinghouse

JUL 1 0 1973

on Adult Education